

### **REMARKS**

By the present Amendment, Claims 1-16 remain pending. Independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments. Filed herewith is a Petition for Extension of Time Under C.F.R. §1.136 requesting a one-month extension of time and providing the requisite fee. In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the objections and rejections are now made moot, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

#### **I. Claim Objection**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7 were objected to because there was insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the reports.” In response to the objection, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to read “at least one report” as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-7 are now in conformity with all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and therefore, are in condition for allowance.

#### **II. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,437,692 to Petite et al. It is asserted in the Office Action that Petite shows a method, system and computer program product for providing access to real-time emissions data of a distributed network comprising: receiving real-time emission data associated with a first generation plant; receiving a request from a user to view at least one of the reports, wherein the request is sent from a web browser; generating a report based at least in part on the emission data; receiving a request from the user to view emission data associated with a second power generation plant; determining if the user is authorized to view emissions data associated with the second power generation plant; and if the user is authorized then providing the user with access to the emission data associated with the second power generation plant. The Examiner noted that a security system based on a log-in interface is well known web server technology and is shown in Petite et al. in Col. 2, lines 50-53. The Examiner stated that the security permissions

noted in that passage would inherently be able to allow or prevent access to data which is appropriate for any specific user.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 to recite “wherein the report includes a plurality of real-time channel boxes, each for a corresponding channel and providing for that channel real-time measurement data, at least one running average and a relative indication of a current measurement value to at least one preset limit.” This feature is discussed in the present application in at least paragraphs 57 through 60. With reference to Petite et al., it is noted that there is no teaching or suggestion in Petite et al. that data may be processed and presented to the user over the Internet in the form of channel boxes, wherein each channel box provides certain information about that channel, including real-time measurement data, running average information, and a relative indication of the current measurement value to at least one preset limit. As illustrated in Figs. 7, 8, and 9 of the present application, an array of channel boxes is displayed to the user so that the user can glean relevant information of the current and historical status of the channel and with regard to the current measurement value the status of the channel with regard to preset limits.

Applicants further assert that several of the dependent claims independently recite patentable features. For example, dependent Claim 6 recites “receiving a request from a user to view calibration data, wherein the request is sent from a Web browser; generating a report requesting the requested calibration data,” (Emphasis added). This claim was rejected based upon the disclosure of Petite et al. at col. 12, line 41 through col. 13, line 30. However, upon close review of Petite et al., and in particular the cited text of Petite et al., Applicants fail to see teaching of the steps of receiving calibration data and generating a report presenting calibration data. The cited text in Petite et al. references the uploading of vehicle diagnostics codes associated with a vehicle and the use of rain gauge data for determining when to actuate a sprinkler system. Neither of these examples teach or suggest the receiving and reporting of calibration data associated with a power generation plant, as recited in Claim 6, and therefore, Claim 6 is patentable distinguishable over Petite et al.


Accordingly, since Petite et al. fails to teach or suggest the channel boxes as recited in each of amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, said claims are in condition for allowance.

Likewise, as a matter of law, dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable independent claim notwithstanding their independent recitation of patentable features.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The Applicants believe they have responded to each matter raised by the Examiner. Allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited. Any questions may be directed to the undersigned at 404.853.8233. It is not believed that fees for addition of claims are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-5029.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Malvern U. Griffin III  
Reg. No. 38,899

Date: January 30, 2006

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP  
999 Peachtree Street NE  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3996  
404.853.8233  
404.853.8806 (fax)